



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

English soil, is now suffered nearly to monopolize the manufacture of English opinion on all the subjects with which he deals. Upon the particular point of the value of the imitative element in the first construction of language, no other treatise has come under our notice that is anything like so good as Mr. Wedgwood's, and Müller and his school may safely be challenged to meet and answer its arguments. There is, to be sure, a deeper question underlying this of specific theories respecting the origin of language, — namely, the relation of language itself to thought, the nature of the aid it furnishes to the operations of the mind, the character of the inducement that called it forth and that still brings about its increase. A radical, though often unspoken and unconscious difference upon these points prevents those who discuss the general subject from getting upon common ground and appreciating one another's arguments; in their settlement is involved the acceptance or rejection of that of the imitative theory.

One oversight Mr. Wedgwood commits in his reply to Müller; he argues against the theory of phonetic types, produced in the mind by the impact of an idea after a fashion analogous with the ringing of a bell on being struck, as if it were still Müller's, not noticing that in the last edition of his *Lectures* this author steps out from under the burden of it, leaving it to rest upon the shoulders of those who had taken it up on his supposed authority.

- 
2. — *The Histories of Livy. Books I, XXI, and XXII. With Extracts from other Books.* Edited and annotated by THOMAS CHASE, M. A., Professor of Philology in Haverford College, etc. Philadelphia: Eldredge and Brother. 1872. pp. 364.

MR. CHASE is well known to all classical scholars in America as truly one of themselves, — accurate, thorough, and most enthusiastic. While tutor at Harvard, many years ago, he brought together in a very pleasing form the various portions of Cicero's writings which treat of immortality. More recently, as professor in Pennsylvania, he has edited Horace and the *Æneid*. We have here, in a form which has already proved very popular, the whole of those three books of Livy which are most commonly read in our colleges, followed by extracts from others.

In his Preface, Professor Chase has explained his principles of textual construction, and of Latin orthography. His chief guides are very properly Madvig and Gronovius. We confess *Gronov* and *Vergil* — in writing English — savor to us of intense affectation. He has, however,

duly consulted all other prominent editors, especially the latest, — Hertz and Weissenborn.

We entirely approve of his constructing a text for himself, and, with some hesitation, of his principles of orthography. This will, however, seem uncouth to many who still prefer their old *mumpsimus* to the new-fangled *sumpsimus* of Ritschl and Munro. Even Professor Chase feels that it entails constant notes like this, “*adpetendo* = *appetendo*.” If such explanations are required, even after the note on page 229, the whole system of spelling is too hard for our pupils and teachers; if not, they waste room badly.

The account of Livy and his style is good; but we wish the young student had been told exactly what periods of Roman history are covered by the books preserved to us, and what by those lost.

In the notes, Professor Chase states his “aim, as it was in the editions of Horace and Virgil, to give such aid as is most necessary and useful for students in our colleges and schools.” In pursuance of this aim, he has given a taste of almost every kind of note. We have text criticism from Madvig and Alschefski, historical exegesis from Seeley and Mommsen; we have all sorts of syntactic points discussed, and grammars of all grades referred to. We have frequent translations, not merely of specially difficult or elegant passages, but of single phrases and even words.

The reflections on the subject-matter are earnest without being stilted, and not at all too many; and special care has been taken to explain the *practical use* of words and forms in Latin, — a point singularly neglected in our schools.

And while authorities are honorably quoted, they are never slavishly followed, but have clearly been worked up into a consistent, intelligent whole. Professor Anthon adopted exactly the opposite process, — to transfer verbatim without acknowledgment. This is truly Mr. Chase's own edition of Livy, not Madvig's nor Weissenborn's, nor yet a *hash* of these or any number of others.

This is in our eyes a great editorial merit; and yet it is sometimes painful to think that the very care of an editor to give his own notes and opinions may make his books unusable for other teachers who prefer their own views. Still, there are very few American teachers competent to differ from Mr. Chase on the ground of superior perception; still fewer, alas! on the score of equal learning.

We repeat emphatically then, that this edition, like the Horace and Virgil edited by him recently, is the edition of a scholar; of a sound scholar, and of one who has deserved well of scholarship in America. And yet we seriously doubt if these editions as they stand are well

adapted to the class they are meant to reach ; if, indeed, such merits as they do possess are even intelligible to more than a very few outside the ring of Mr. Chase's fellow-scholars, who do not need their help !

For he has proposed to himself too comprehensive a task. No one edition of Livy can suit "our schools and colleges" as a whole. Our democratic system of education is slow to recognize grades of proficiency ; it classes pupils almost entirely by age and date of entrance, so that the whole of a class are aggrieved if they have not one book ; and so, too, all academies and high schools expect to rank as equal, though notoriously unequal ; and the same is absolutely true of "colleges." Therefore it is, that Mr. Chase, in trying to find something for everybody, is at once deficient and superfluous for anybody. There are notes in his Livy and Horace which would seem abstruse to seniors in many of our most respectable colleges ; there are others which will be elementary to forward pupils in many of our schools. Indeed the Index of Names in his Horace has no excuse at all ; pupils and teachers neglect their classical dictionaries badly enough already, without being thus directly encouraged to. All the authors he has edited, especially the two poets, are read in such a variety of institutions that an edition which is too easy for one half is almost too hard for the other ; or, unless we are willing to include everything, and transcend all bounds in size, we must make an arbitrary selection, alike in elementary, middling, and advanced notes.

This has been Mr. Chase's fate. The things he leaves out are just as much needed as the things he puts in. Take, for example, Hannibal's speech (XXI. § 43) and the section introducing it ; both full of difficulties for scholars in every stage of proficiency. Mr. Chase translates *habitus animorum* in § 42 and *modo* (only) in § 43. Why then is there no note on *vulgo*, or *paribus*, on both of which boys are warranted to stumble ? He has very briefly explained the first use of *spectaculum* ; but he ignores the peculiar force of *facinus*, which is singularly apt to be misinterpreted. And while we have a hieroglyphic note on the text followed in *agite dum*, he adopts the conjectural reading *ut quisque* with simple italics for the *ut*, saying not a word of the manuscript reading *et quisque*, and its curious idiomatic use of *quisque* for *quisquis*, which it seems to us is far preferable.

If Mr. Chase were teaching a class, probably every one of these points and a dozen others would come up before the pupils. But the requirements of space have forced him to make what we say again seems a purely arbitrary selection. This was so strongly seen in Virgil that the last six books, hard as they are, are hardly annotated at

all; and such passages as Evander's speech (*Æn.* XI. 151 *seqq.*) has its chief difficulties absolutely ignored. Even in the elementary edition of *Æneid* I. – VI., we have only three lines and a half on *Æneid* VI. 562 – 579 (not a word on *Castigatque auditque*, which every editor but Heyne gets wrong, through ignorance of Roman law), nothing on VI. 580 – 589, three lines on 590 – 593, and not one word till 611! And this in an edition so elementary that it has a vocabulary of words! It is not too much to say that for every note of every kind teachers will have to supply another of which Mr. Chase gives no hint.

What, then, is the remedy? As regards the *Livy*, we should say that students who need notes as elementary as some of Mr. Chase's are not up to *Livy* at all, and certainly not up to his other notes. Had he struck out three fourths of his grammar references, and half his translations, there would have been room to complete his advanced notes, and made a truly valuable edition for scholars in our best colleges. Whereas in *Virgil* we should ask for a much more elementary edition as better for schools.

But the examination of these and other really meritorious editions convinces us that the best way of teaching the classics is to use in the class editions without notes, providing or requiring pupils to obtain abundant works of reference; and above all, insisting that both pupils and teachers, if they really claim to share the noble name of scholars, shall cease to hope for satisfaction from manual editions, and should go directly for instruction to the great critical and exegetical editions of master scholars. We believe that, for class requirements, every year more and more of our best teachers and best scholars will prefer to make and use *their own notes*.

---

3. — *Voltaire*. By JOHN MORLEY. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1872.

THIS is hardly a life of Voltaire, as that word is generally understood. It is no combination of dates and trivial incidents which go so far to make up many biographies, and which, indeed, are necessary for our comprehension of a character, but it is rather a presentation of Voltaire on the supposition that we are already familiar with the main incidents of his life, and a discussion of his influence and various views. There is, of course, a great deal of biographical information; one cannot write of Voltaire and leave Voltaire out, but it perhaps presupposes a greater familiarity of the reader with the facts of his life than might always be found to be the case. For, while Strauss and Renan are